



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF NOTES

### *A Word with reference to 'Emperor'-Worship in Babylonia*

Professor Mercer has rendered a distinct service to his colleagues by massing in his article '*Emperor'-Worship in Babylonia* (*JAOS* 36. 360-380) many widely scattered bits of evidence on the subject. The writer regrets, however, that he is obliged to dissent from the main thesis of that article—a thesis which, stated in Professor Mercer's own words, is that 'Babylonians were always conscious of the humanity of their rulers, and though the distance between a god and a man was not great, yet they never seem to have mistaken the one for the other' (p. 377). In other words, he seeks to prove that there was no such thing as emperor-worship.

Professor Mercer's treatment of the material which he cites does not impress the reader as altogether unbiased. At every step of the argument effort is made to minimize the force of the facts which are cited. The writer is inclined to think that a fair-minded reader who knew nothing of the subject would be led to think that there must have been some real worship of emperors or kings, when the determinative for god is so often prefixed to their names. If, however, we were to grant that the evidence accumulated by Professor Mercer is not decisive, and that it is fairly capable of being interpreted as he has interpreted it, it must be noted that he has overlooked some very important evidence, and that the facts thus overlooked are fatal to his theory. I refer to the proper names contained in the *Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets*, Parts I-III, Philadelphia, 1905-1914. Part III contains a list of nearly 3,300 persons, while Huber's list, the only one for the Ur-dynasty that Professor Mercer seems to have consulted, contains but about 5,100.

In Part II of this work, pl. 53, there is published a tablet (no. 10), which is dated in 'the year after the *E-bà-ša-iš* [read by some *E-kù-ša-iš*] of Dagan was built.' This was certainly during Dungi's lifetime. Thureau-Dangin thought in 1907 that it was the 39th year of his reign, while Myhrman in 1910 thought it his fiftieth year. The exact year is for our present

purpose irrelevant; it is enough that it was during the lifetime of the king. The tablet is a pay-roll, and the following men received stipends: *Lù-<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi* (Man of the god Dungi), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-ḫe-gál* (May the god Dungi protect), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-ra-kalam-ma* (For the god Dungi is the land), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-kalam-ma-ḫi-li-bi* (The god Dungi—the land is his delight), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-à-uru* (The god Dungi is the reward of the slave), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-a-du-kalam-ma* (The god Dungi is the counselor of the land), *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-ki-ḫar-šag* (With the god Dungi is great favor), *Ka-<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-ib-ta-ê* (The word of the god Dungi goes forth), *Ama-<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-e-<sup>d</sup>Ur-ru* (The mother of the god Dungi is the goddess Urru), and *<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-ú-nam-ti* (The god Dungi is the food of life). Can any one read these proper names<sup>1</sup> borne by men in Dungi's own lifetime, and doubt that real 'emperor'-worship existed in Babylonia?

The tablet which contains these names does not stand alone, but I will take time to cite but one other. *HLC* 52 (Part I, pl. 12) contains (obv. l. 9) the name *Tab-<sup>d</sup>Dun-gi-<sup>d</sup>Nannar* (The god Dungi is the twin<sup>2</sup> of the god Nannar). This tablet is dated in the year Urbillum was destroyed, which was, according to Thureau-Dangin, Dungi's 43d year, but according to Myhrman, his 55th. The tablet was in any case written while Dungi was still living, and the name cited is alone sufficient to overthrow Professor Mercer's whole thesis.

GEORGE A. BARTON

Bryn Mawr College

### *Takku*

In publishing a preliminary translation of a new account of the creation of man (in this *JOURNAL*, 37. 36—40), the writer warned readers (p. 26) not to regard the rendering as final. The tablet is carelessly written and in parts has suffered from breaking. In working over the text again I have reached the conclusion that the divine name read *Tikku* should be read *Takku*, and that it is identical with the name that Langdon read

<sup>1</sup> The writer called attention to these and many other names which throw light on Sumerian religious conceptions in this *JOURNAL*, 34. 315-320.

<sup>2</sup> See the writer's *Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, No. 144<sup>15</sup>.